

### **REMARKS**

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reexamination of the present application. Claims 16, 20, 26 and 29 have been amended, Claims 17-19, 21-25, 27 and 28 have been cancelled and no new claims have been added.

Specifically, independent Claim 16 has been canceled, leaving Claim 30 as the only pending independent claim. Claims previously dependent upon Claim 16 have been canceled or have been amended to depend directly or indirectly on Claim 30.

At page 7 of the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 30-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over PCT Patent Publication No. WO 2003/09108 by Hiel et al. ("Hiel"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that Hiel does not specifically teach that the formulation has elongation properties in excess of glass fiber elongation properties and in this regard, the publication teaches that a modulus of elasticity for the composite core ranges from about 22 Msi to about 37 Msi and that the said composite core comprises one fiber type (glass) and can have a modulus of elasticity in the range of about 6 to about 7 Msi. The Examiner's position is that the elongation properties of the resin material would necessarily be greater than those of the fiber type "to net a cumulative effect in the modulus of elasticity in the resultant composite core that is substantially greater than that of the fibers *per se*." The Examiner concludes that this would render obvious the requirement that the formulation has elongation properties in excess of glass fiber elongation properties. Therefore, the Examiner concludes that the teachings in the publication would render obvious the invention as claimed in present Claims 30-35.

However, the Examiner has provided no basis for the reasoning that the *elongation* of the resin should be selected to be greater than the elongation of glass fibers. The Examiner has only made reference to a net cumulative effect in the modulus of elasticity that is greater than that of the fibers *per se*, and that somehow the elongation properties of the resin would "necessarily" be greater than those of the fiber.



Therefore, reconsideration and removal of this rejection is requested. In the event that this rejection is maintained, clarification as to the Examiner's reasoning as to why such elongation parameters would be obvious is requested.

Applicants do not believe that any additional fees are due with regard to the entry of this paper. However, if any fees are due, please debit those fees from Deposit Account No. 50-1419.

Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecute and or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By: /David F. Dockery Reg No 34323/

David F. Dockery  
Registration No. 34,323  
8055 E. Tufts Avenue, Suite 450  
Denver, CO 80237  
(303) 770-0051

Date: November 27, 2009